Comments on "Strongly magnetized cold degenerate electron gas: Mass-radius relation of the magnetized white dwarf"

Rajaram Nityananda
Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Pune 411008, India[*]

Sushan Konar
National Centre for Radio Astronomy - Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Pune 411007, India[†]

The super-massive white dwarf models proposed by Das & Mukhopadhyaya [Phys. Rev. D **86** 042001 (2012)], based on modifying the equation of state by a super-strong magnetic field in the centre, are very far from equilibrium because of the neglect of Lorentz forces, as has recently been shown by Nityananda & Konar [arXiv:1306.1625].

arXiv:1405.4719v1 [astro-ph.SR] 19 May 2014

Recently, it has been proposed that white dwarfs (stars supported against gravity by electron degeneracy pressure) can have super-Chandrasekhar (2.3 - 2.6 $M_\odot$) masses with radii much smaller than previously thought to be possible ($\sim$ 70 - 600 km) [1, 2]. These models are based on the altered equation of state coming from the quantization of electron motion in super-strong ($\gtrsim 10^{15}$ G) magnetic fields.

The issue here is a counter-intuitive feature of such models – the magnetic pressure (P_m) is not included in the equation of hydrostatic equilibrium even though its value at the centre exceeds the electron pressure (P_e) by nearly two orders of magnitude. The justification given (in [1] and [3]) is that the field is uniform in the central region of interest, and therefore there is no force coming from the gradient of P_m. The field is then presumed to taper off to much smaller values at the surface (consistent with observations) without affecting the analysis which relies solely on electron pressure.

Consider a star of mass M, radius R with a magnetic field B. In an averaged spherically symmetric model (as in [1]) the equation of hydrostatic equilibrium, at a radius r inside the star reads,

$$\frac{dP_e}{dr} + \frac{dP_m}{dr} = -\rho(r)g(r), \qquad (1)$$

where $g(r)(= GM(r)/r^2)$ is the radially inward gravitational force on a unit mass. Integrating both sides of Eq.(1), from the centre to the surface of the star, denoted by suffixes c and s, we obtain

$$(P_{\rm ec} - P_{\rm es}) + (P_{\rm mc} - P_{\rm ms}) = \int \rho(r)g(r)dr. \qquad (2)$$

The second bracket on the right hand side should be smaller than the first, if the neglect of the magnetic contribution to the hydrostatic equation is to be valid everywhere. But (equating the surface pressures to zero) the exact opposite is true in these models when the central magnetic pressure becomes larger than the pressure of the degenerate electrons.

No attempt to taper off a large, uniform magnetic field in the centre to essentially zero ($B_s/B_c << 1$) at the surface can avoid a gradient of P_m to be much larger than that of P_e (at least in certain locations), which balances gravity in the proposed models [4].

The above argument would be strictly applicable only if the field was sufficiently disordered to result in an average isotropic pressure within a region smaller than the scale length over which pressure and density vary significantly. It has been pointed out [3] that magnetic tension, in an ordered field, could actually act in an opposite way to magnetic pressure, and possibly play a significant role in stabilizing a non-spherical configuration with a suitably ordered field. We have shown that ordered fields in an anisotropic model can not qualitatively change the conclusions drawn from the averaged spherical model [4], using the property that tension in one direction is offset by lateral pressure in the two perpendicular directions.

It should be noted further that the electrons, in the proposed models, have Fermi energies significantly above their rest energy (for example, $E_{\rm F} \sim 20\ {\rm m}_e\ {\rm c}^2$). When the magnetic pressure is two or more orders of magnitude greater than the electron pressure it implies that the rest energy of the magnetic field could be close to the rest energy of the nuclei, per electron. This makes the equation of state approach $p \propto \rho$ and points to the need for a general relativistic treatment since pressure gravitates in general relativity.

Another important factor under such conditions is neutronization (inverse β-decay), as a result of which the electron number decreases and the ionic component of the pressure (which has been completely neglected so far) begins to become important. Moreover, at higher densities pycnonuclear reactions would modify the composition of the matter making it even more difficult for the star to be treated as an ordinary white dwarf (with standard compositions). The proposed formalism does not provide for these energetically favorable processes either. We find that while setting up the modified equation of state for the electrons, in presence of quantizing field, due consideration has not been given to these aspects.

Though some of these concerns regarding the equation of state have now been addressed [5, 6], the basic concern about the

[*] rajaram.nityananda@gmail.com,now at Azim Premji University, Bangalore
[†] sushan@ncra.tifr.res.in; http://www.ncra.tifr.res.in:8081/~sushan/

equilibrium of the proposed models remain. The results from a self-consistent investigation into the structures of strongly magnetized white dwarfs has just become available [7] and it is seen that while the masses of such objects do exceed the traditional Chandrasekhar limit significantly ($M \sim 1.9\ M_{\odot}$), neither do the radii and the density profiles deviate too far from those of the non-magnetized white dwarfs nor are the maximum field strengths ($B \sim 10^{14}$ G) very different from those expected from simple stability arguments [4].

In summary, we find that a fortuitous modification of the equation of state in presence of strong magnetic fields to be responsible for the super-Chandrasekhar mass obtained in the proposed models [1, 2, 8, 9] with a neglect of the magnetic pressure.

[1] U. Das and B. Mukhopadhyay, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 042001 (2012), arXiv:1204.1262 [astro-ph.HE].

[2] U. Das and B. Mukhopadhyay, International Journal of Modern Physics D **21**, 1242001 (2012), arXiv:1205.3160 [astro-ph.HE].

[3] U. Das and B. Mukhopadhyay, ArXiv e-prints (2013), arXiv:1304.3022 [astro-ph.SR].

[4] R. Nityananda and S. Konar, ArXiv e-prints (2013), arXiv:1306.1625 [astro-ph.SR].

[5] N. Chamel, A. F. Fantina, and P. J. Davis, ArXiv e-prints (2013), arXiv:1306.3444 [astro-ph.SR].

[6] J. G. Coelho, R. M. Marinho, Jr., M. Malheiro, R. Negreiros, D. L. Cáceres, J. A. Rueda, and R. Ruffini, ArXiv e-prints (2013), arXiv:1306.4658 [astro-ph.SR].

[7] P. Bera and D. Bhattacharya, ArXiv e-prints (2014), arXiv:1405.2282 [astro-ph.SR].

[8] U. Das and B. Mukhopadhyay, Physical Review Letters **110**, 071102 (2013), arXiv:1301.5965 [astro-ph.SR].

[9] U. Das, B. Mukhopadhyay, and A. R. Rao, ApJ **767**, L14 (2013), arXiv:1303.4298 [astro-ph.HE].